



BA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536

PUBLIC COPY

FILE: [REDACTED]  
EAC 02 025 50214

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: **JAN 30 2003**

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Petition for Special Immigrant Battered Spouse Pursuant to Section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent closely warranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be rejected, and the case will be remanded for further action.

The petitioner is a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic who is seeking classification as a special immigrant pursuant to section 204(a)(1)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(A)(iii), as the battered spouse of a United States citizen.

The director determined that the petitioner failed to submit evidence, as had been requested, to establish that he: (1) has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage; or is the parent of a child who has been battered by, or has been the subject of extreme cruelty perpetrated by, the citizen or lawful permanent resident during the marriage, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E); and (2) is a person of good moral character pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(F). The director, therefore, denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner states that he misplaced the "blue" sheet (request for additional evidence) on which he was advised to submit additional information within 60 days. He submits additional evidence.

The petitioner was requested on January 31, 2002, to submit additional evidence to establish that he has met the requirements of 8 C.F.R. 204.2(c)(1)(i)(E) and (F). The director listed examples of evidence he may submit to establish eligibility. Because the petitioner failed to respond to the director's request, the petition was denied on July 15, 2002.

8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(13) provides that if all requested initial evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(15) provides that a denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen under 8 C.F.R. 103.5.

An appeal was subsequently filed by the petitioner. However, there is no appeal of the director's decision in the present case. The appeal will, therefore, be rejected. The petitioner, however, has submitted additional documents for the record. Therefore, the case will be remanded to the director so that he may reopen the matter on a Service motion, and adjudicate the petition supported by the

additional documentation. The director shall enter a new decision which, if adverse to the petitioner, is to be certified to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, for review.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected. The case is remanded for appropriate action consistent with the above discussion and entry of a new decision.